

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain active in the application. Claims 1, 3, 14, 19 and 20 have been amended. Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Yukinara et al. (USP 6,466,073) [Yukinara].

The Office Action states in the section Allowable Subject Matter that Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have now incorporated in independent claims 1, 14, and 20 the limitations recited in Claim 12, now cancelled.

Claims 1-2, 5-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaushik et al (US Publication No. 2005/0022038) [Kaushik] in view of Mirov et al. (USP 6,728,890) [Mirov].

Applicants submit that neither Kaushik nor Mirov, whether independently or in combination teach:

“having a companion chip perform a frequency change operation after the frequency change operation has been completed by the plurality of processors”

as previously recited in the now cancelled Claim 12 and now incorporated in the independent claims.

Thus, Applicants submit that in view of the foregoing the combination of Kaushik with Mirov does not render Claims 1-2, 5-11 and 13 unpatentable.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the aforementioned rejection has been overcome, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the stated rejection.

Claims 3-4, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Kaushik and Mirov and Kahn (USP 7,290,161) matter.

Applicants submit that as presented *supra*, the combination of Kaushik and Mirov no longer render the stated claim unpatentable. Now, adding Kahn to the teachings of Kaushik and Mirov the combination of the three cited references cannot render claims 3-4 and 19-20 unpatentable for failing to teach

“having a companion chip perform a frequency change operation after the frequency change operation has been completed by the plurality of processors”

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the aforementioned rejection has been overcome, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the stated rejection.

Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 16 and 18 over Yukinara and Yatsuda (USP 6,845,073) is unwarranted for the same reasons provided for the previous rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that they have now overcome all the objections and rejections to the application, and respectfully request that all the amendments be entered, and that the Examiner pass all the pending claims to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER A. SANDON, ET AL.

By: ____/H. Daniel Schnurmann/ ____
H. Daniel Schnurmann, Agent
Registration No. 35,791
Tel. No. (845) 894 2481